DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 008 HE 016 786

AUTHOR Monahan, William G.; And Others
TITLE Fiscal Conditions and Implications in Selected Schools and Colleges of Education in Comprehensive Universities, 1982-83.
INSTITUTION Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and Affiliated Private Universities.
PUB DATE 31 May 83
NOTE 74p.; Best copy available.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Responsibility; Case Studies; *Change Strategies; College Planning; College Role; *Financial Problems; Financial Support; Higher Education; Problem Solving; *Resource Allocation; *Retrenchment; *Schools of Education; School Surveys; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Comprehensive Universities

ABSTRACT

Financial problems confronting schools and colleges of education in major, comprehensive universities were assessed. Interviews were conducted to determine current resources and collegiate missions. Each institution indicated which of four categories described its circumstances: downsizing, eroding, treading, or enhancing. The role of leadership strategies was addressed and recommendations were offered for deans regarding such problems as academic policies. Eighty-one universities described themselves in July 1982 and again in January 1983. As part of a second survey, comments were solicited from deans who wanted to clarify their current circumstances. Selected statements from deans are included. Of the 32 institutions indicating some change in status from July 1982 to January 1983, 19 moved down in status and 13 moved up. Based on visits to 24 colleges and their survey responses, observations are offered about the following issues: the nature of fiscal problems, planning, the information environment, faculty concerns and involvement, and the graduate-undergraduate dilemma. Five case studies are also included. In addition, five patterns of retrenchment and criteria for planning allocation decisions are suggested. Strategies for alleviating the consequences of fiscal problems are also recommended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED237008

Fiscal Conditions and Implications in Selected Schools and Colleges of Education in Comprehensive Universities, 1982-83

by

William G. Monahan, George Denemark, Robert Egbert
Frederick Giles, and Donald McCarty

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William G. Monahan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE016 726

FOREWORD

The inquiry reported in this paper was commissioned by the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, and Affiliated Private Universities. The report explores aspects of the deepening financial problems currently confronting schools and colleges of education in many major, comprehensive universities, both public and private. The inquiry consisted of interviews by university faculty and administrators of their colleagues regarding their current resources vis-a-vis their collegiate missions and the missions of their parent institutions. The inquiry was conceived during a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Association in St. Louis, Missouri in May, 1982, at which time it was agreed that academic Education units were experiencing critical fiscal problems, the nature of which was not well known. It was agreed also that there is considerable value in gaining insight into how institutions are coping with fiscal stress. Academic administrators in schools and colleges of education might be better able to react to, plan for, or minimize the dangers inherent in fiscal stress if such insights were made available.

Because Bill Monahan was stepping out of the Deanship of the College of Human Resources and Education, West Virginia University, it was agreed that he would form the inquiry team and coordinate the investigation. Several very able administrators, all of them also relinquishing deanships, were recruited to the effort: George Denemark, University of Kentucky; Robert Egbert, University of Nebraska; Fred Giles, University of Washington; and Don McCarty, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

EDITOR'S PREFACE

This paper represents the efforts of individuals without whose assistance and cooperation such a project could never have been pursued.

In addition to visiting and interviewing persons in each of 26 major comprehensive universities, members of the investigation team also assumed responsibility for specific parts of the final report itself. To George Denemark, formerly Dean of the College of Education at the University of Kentucky, I am particularly grateful for his significant contributions to the section dealing with the pattern of resource reduction; to Don McCarty, former Dean at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, for his work on the recommendations and conclusions sections; to Fred Giles, former Dean at the University of Washington, for his analysis of strategies and tactical efforts in the face of continuing constraints on resources; and to Bob Egbert, formerly Dean at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln for various parts of the paper related to the need for central administrative officers to deal with the importance of Education units within major universities. While each of these individuals provided comprehensive material and comments, the major portion of the final report itself was primarily my own responsibility, and they should not be held liable for its shortcomings.

We are also indebted to the institutions, administrators, and faculty who cooperated with us. They gave generously of their time and attention and were candid and straightforward. Our overall impression is that SCDE's in major institutions are valued and respected. Certainly there are immense problems, as this report details, but in the main there is also much reason for confidence and optimism. Finally, this project owes special gratitude to James M. Kauffman, Associate Dean for Research at the University of Virginia, for his final editing of the manuscript; he has made it clearer and much more coherent and yet maintained our style and intent.

William G. Monahan
Morgantown, West Virginia
May 31, 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Categories and Findings	2
Major Observations	14
Some Illustrative Representations of Type	30
Patterns of Retrenchment	52
Strategies for Coping with Declining Resources in SCDE's	57
Impressions and Recommendations Based on the Study	61
Recommendations for Central Administration	65
Concluding Comment	66

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Fiscal Status, July 1, 1982 and January 1, 1983 of SCDEs by Geographic Region.....	5
2	Selected Verbatim Statements from Deans in Response to the Second Survey (January, 1983) by Geographic Region.....	7
3	Summary of Categorical Resources, First and Second Surveys.....	12
4	Summary of Changes in Status, First to Second Survey.....	13

Fiscal Conditions and Implications in Selected Schools and Colleges of Education in Comprehensive Universities, 1982-83

William G. Monahan, George Denemark, Robert Egbert
Frederick Giles, and Donald McCarty

This is the final report of an inquiry commissioned by the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and Affiliated Private Universities (ACSESULGC/APU, hereinafter referred to as "the Association" or "the Deans"). As was pointed out in the preliminary report,[1] the inquiry was not a rigorous empirical analysis: No formal sampling methodology was employed, no pre-investigative data-gathering activities were pursued, and no hypotheses were tested. On the contrary, each member of the investigating team employed his own style for gathering information. Consequently, as is always the case with informal, subjective analysis, the observations and conclusions are largely the personal judgments of those individuals who conducted the investigation.

Having made the usual disclaimers regarding subjective interpretation, the fact remains that the findings are accurately reported; moreover, there is little question that the conditions found and the concerns expressed are reasonably representative of the types of institutions visited.

---

[1] "Preliminary Report: Fiscal Conditions in Colleges and Schools of Education in Comprehensive Universities," W.G. Monahan et. al., West Virginia University, Morgantown, 1982.

This final report also differs somewhat from the preliminary report in that we have not only updated the survey but expanded on some of our initial observations. We have included also (1) descriptive material regarding particularly interesting situations, (2) more extensive comments regarding the role of leadership strategies, (3) more extensive recommendations to deans regarding such problems as academic policies, and (4) strategies for alleviating the consequences of critical fiscal problems.

Parsimony was the principle guiding the investigation's conceptualization and design. The investigative team was first recruited. The composition of the team determined to a great extent the sites to be visited and the persons to be interviewed. This saved time and money.

In considering potential sites for the team to visit, it was decided that to the extent possible institutions in a variety of geographical areas and having a broad range of variation in resource situations should be explored. As a beginning then, it was necessary to determine, even if somewhat imprecisely, the range of fiscal circumstances among SCDE's. Consequently, the membership of the Association was surveyed, first in July, 1982 and again in January, 1983. Each institution was asked to indicate which among four categories most nearly described its own current status.[2] Although the original survey

---

[2]Both surveys were based on the mailing list available to us as of December, 1981. A few institutions may thus not be included in the listing in Table 1. At the same time, as will be noted, some institutions responded to only one of the surveys or to neither.

data did not constitute the major basis for assigning site visits, the information was particularly useful in planning and did prove a factor in some rearrangements and substitutions. Geography and fiscal circumstance were about equal factors inthe final selection of the 24 institutions visited by investigating team members.

Categories and Findings

Prior to selecting institutions for site visits, four categorical descriptions were provided to the membership of the Association. Each institution was asked to indicate which of four categories most accurately described its circumstances at that time. These categories were:

DOWNSIZING--significant restructuring is in process, is proposed, or is being seriously considered; some thrusts, programs, units, and/or degree programs and options will be eliminated, consolidated, or transferred.

ERODING--constraints affect scope of activity; resources are being cut back, but so far, programs are still in place.

TREADING--the SCDE is managing only to hold its own.

ENHANCING--resources are expanding (whether modest or substantial); budget increases are expected.

While these descriptions are only a crude scale, they reflect conditions that the member institutions had little difficulty in interpreting, and the response to the survey was much better than average. Some ambiguities are evident in these categories, of course. For example, in the case of some institutions both "eroding" and "downsizing" may reflect deliberate and thoughtful planning over a period of time. Some institutions, having enjoyed previous years of budget expansion, described themselves

as "eroding", a negative description that fails to take fairly recent ennancements into account. In a few cases, institutions nad already worked through some "downsizing" in previous years, a situation these categories do not easily accommodate. Based on the mailing list of 1981 December, 119 institutions were listed and subsequently contacted for the first survey, and of those, 81 (68%) responded. Table 1 reflects how SCDEs described themselves in July, 1982, and again in January, 1983. As part of the second survey we solicited comments from those deans who wanted to provide clarification or explanations of their current circumstances. These are included in Table 2 (see map for geographical designations).

TABLE 1

Fiscal Status, July 1, 1982 and Janaury 1, 1983 of SCDEs
by Geographic Region

Region	Downsizing		Eroding		Treading		Enhancing		No Response	
	7/82	1/83	7/82	1/83	7/82	1/83	7/82	1/83	7/82	1/83
Northeast (7) *	3		3	2	2	5	2	1	5	7
Mid-east (6)	2	1	2	3	1	1	2	3	6	6
Southeast (2)		1	2	2	2	2		1	2	
Deep-south (6)	1	1	3	4	5	6	1		4	4
Mid-south (3)			3	6	4	1			1	1
Mid-west & Upper mid-west (7)	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	2	6	6
Southwest (3)	2	1		3	3	4	2	3	5	1
Plains & Upper Plains (4)			5	3	1	4	1		1	1
Mountain (5)		1		3	2	3	3	1	3	
Pacific Southwest (3)	1		2	1	1	1	2	1	1	4
Pacific Northwest (2)	1		1			2		1	2	
TOTALS	14	9	25	31	23	33	17	13	36	30

*Number in parentheses indicates number of states in the region.

Explanatory notes--Table 1

To illustrate the imprecision of the terms used to describe the categories of status, one institution indicated that its resources were "eroding" but pointed out that this had been by deliberate intent. Thus "erosion," which implies a natural process of reduction, does not account for planned reductions over time. At least one "eroding" institution, thus, was not engaged in any program eliminations or reductions that directly affected its students' options but is carrying out a process of orderly managerial prudence that began long before many public institutions came upon bad times. For some institutions, a resources crisis began in the early 1970s' and by comparison they are now well beyond the rest of us in dealing with it. The same can be said, in a sense, for other institutions which elected a well-planned restructuring of programs some years previously or have been enduring well-planned though critical downsizing for a number of years. In most cases, it is useful to take contextual and temporal factors into consideration in qualifying the circumstances in which institutions may find themselves; what IS happening is always a function, to some extent, of what has gone on previously.

Some institutions indicated that they fell between the categories listed. In some such cases, the use of the word "only" in the description of "Treading" was properly pointed out as being indicative of deterioration when that was not actually happening; in some cases, the status was "Treading" but the situation was indeed stable and reasonably healthy, not deteriorating. Apparently, institutions are always in a delicate kind of staging status in which they are awaiting legislative deliberation. Accordingly, institutions might anticipate going up or down in status. Thus "Treading" seems the best description of the condition of the moment. One institution that had been "Eroding" for several years was put in a "Treading" pattern as it anticipated the succession of a new university president.

TABLE 2

Selected Verbatim Statements from Deans in Response to the Second Survey (January, 1983) by Geographic Region

Commentary	Region
Our situation is stable with good prospects for steady support, and enhancement in the science/math and educational technology areas.	Mountain state
No significant reductions this time around in professional staff; reductions in classified staff that were significant last year have not occurred this year. Equipment/Supplies/Travel always insufficient: enrollment is stable.	Northeast state
On forced choice, we would be closer to "treading" but word 'only' bothers me some; too early right now to predict implications of a budget freeze.	Southeast state
All units suffered a 2.2% recision in FY '83 budget. We expect the legislature to provide merit salary increases of 4-5% and other increases of 7%. The university budget process implies that units will be at 95% to 102% of FY '83 levels with some reallocation among units. Our SCH this year is good--I expect no major reduction of FY '84.	Plains state
Over the past three years college has lost 25 positions through attrition...We will probably need to go through an additional budget cut-back amounting to 1.5 to 3.0% (of a $4 million budget). In order to carry our "tax" will probably have to forego recruitment for four vacant positions--there is much discussion of reorganizing colleges into more efficient units.	Mid-south state
We received our first indication of a little growing difficulty; had to endure a $40,000 reduction from the general fund allocation--do not anticipate any more for remainder of this year and are	Deep-south state

TABLE 2 (continued)

supposed to get that back next time around.	
While the college had had dramatic reductions in enrollment, we have been permitted to fill 'most' vacancies (if they are in needed areas). Resources are being diverted to more research and to graduate programs.	Mid-east state
We are in the midst of a comprehensive review of the school and should have a report on expected budget cuts in next couple of weeks; other Schools have endured cuts of from 15% to 33% and we're bigger than they are. Meanwhile the university has to defer another $30 million so "DOWNSIZING" is amost inevitable.	Upper-midwest state
Our state has recently enacted historic legislation which will expand the educational enterprise; this will undoubtedly have impact on IHE's--hopefully in a most favorable manner.	Deep-south state
It now appears that we will have another round of budget cuts. The Governor and the legislature likely will not increase our '84 FY budget over the current year so if salary increments are to come, they will have to come from reallocation. The situation is tenuous.	Mid-south state
We're in-between 'Treading' and 'Eroding', ..we're holding our own in that no tenured faculty will be eliminated without a "full-blown" review, but we are eroding our base; we took a 1 1/2% reduction while other parts of the institution took 3-5%; never-the-less, tax receipts are well below projections so some are presuming still further reductions and if that's the case, we'll clearly be in the 'eroding' category.	Urban state institution, Mid-south border state
Considerable discussion concerning reallocation. A review of all university programs just completed for that purpose. Broad hints are that the COE will lose FTE support in next FY budget.	Upper Mountain state

TABLE 2 (continued)

Nothing much will be known until our legislature gives us the budget in April; If the Governor's budget goes through, we will lose two "full" lines.	(Sister institution of above) Upper Mountain state
Actually, the most accurate description would be "modest intentional downsizing." We have adopted a reallocation process which will certainly lead to reduction of some programs to support enhancement of others. For this college, this must be viewed as a negative step--downsizing; Current economic conditions suggest a negative situation for FY 83-84.	Upper Plains state
We are in excellent shape considering others; no cuts and a gradual increase in budgets, salaries, etc.	(Sister urban institution of above) Upper Plains
University enrollment continues to increase while teacher education enrollment is still declining. State is threatening to cut appropriations for coming biennium and demand for shifting of resources is becoming much more intense--losses seem to be a matter of time.	Upper Plains state
So far, we are in reasonably good shape--if the University itself gets the support it's asking, we would be enhanced to a larger degree.	(Sister institution of above) Upper Plains state
We're now eroding somewhat; we got special funding for the teacher program but now know there will be a general cut-back of about 4% next year; we think we will keep the state program alive but nothing near the 4.7% authorized. (paraphrased)	Southwest border state
We've been in the "enhancing" category for several years but about 30 days ago the Governor announced a freeze on all positions due to shortfall in oil/gas revenues--we must cut 4% of the current budget and all projections suggest a lean '83-'84.	(Sister institution) Southwest border state
Things seem now to have leveled off--Governor has proposed a 23% increase for higher education in the next Biennium--	Pacific Northwest state

TABLE 2 (continued)

remains to be seen what the legislature will do!	
Because we now have a new President coming aboard, budget cuts planned for the next two and three years have been put on "hold."	Mid-east state
Following the reorganization which went into effect in the Fall ('82), I would say that we are now 'treading.' We may lose some of turnover lines but will replace some others. Apparently, overall salary increases for all SUNY institutions look good for next year so I think "treading" describes us.	SUNY institution, Northeast
We're "eroding" and bordering on "downsizing." Base payroll was reduced 4%; as of December 15, 5% of total university budget was impounded and academic units assigned 2.5% cuts; COE relinquished funds on all vacant positions and had to reduce operating costs by 15.5%. Also, summer quarter reduced by 11% for '83 and 15% for the coming summer. We're phasing out one MA program and projections are very negative at state level.	Mid-south institution
We're 'eroding' especially at the undergraduate and Masters levels but our advanced graduate programs are seeing some expansion.	(Sister institution of above in more Urban area)
We're experiencing some enhancement; keeping all positions though not adding; getting very modest budget increases and gaining with endowed ones.	Southwest state
Had a 10.9% increase in graduate enrollments; 9.6% increase in undergraduates. Three and a half new positions funded in '83-'84 budget and excellent support for research projects is emerging from new concept of the college as organized in terms of "improvement centers."	(Sister Institution) Southwest state
Our Governor has just (January, '83) announced a salary 'freeze' for all higher education for next year on top of an already mandated 6% cut. This means that we are now in the 'eroding' category. The COE had been cut a percentage or two	Upper deep south state

TABLE 2 (continued)

more than other units because our enrollments have declined (20% over last 5 years).	
New cuts have been imposed by Executive Order 85-25--but the legislature is in session now considering new taxes and other possible state funds. We'll survive!	Pacific northwest state
The choice between "eroding" and "treading" is a matter of judgement. In some respects we've about held our own over the past few years except for the impact of inflation; programs have not been lost but to some extent we have only been able to keep up appearances, since a lot has been lost that isn't all that visible--new areas are not covered because faculty can't be added and we're in drastic shape on any kind of support services.	Upper-Midwest state
(The state) faces a deficit of $1 1/2 billion during the '83-'85 Biennium. Depending on what the Governor and legislature decide to do about it, we might remain 'eroding' or regress to 'downsizing'.	(Sister Urban institution of above) Upper Mid-west
In the fifth consecutive year of cuts, this time in order to meet the required reductions will have to furlough faculty and staff for 9 to 11 days; situation is university-wide and Education is not explicitly targeted at any relative degree greater than any other academic unit. Revenues are simply way down compared to budget planning; hopefully, legislature now in session will find some way to provide some relief.	Mid-east state
We're 'treading' at the moment; state faces over $500 million deficit and we will learn more about the impact of this in the next few weeks. In the last year, the university has developed a statement on "what to do with tenured faculty in time of financial exigency." Also, college is completing a major reorganization.	Upper Mid-west state
We're definitely 'downsizing' now; the state is in a severe depression and major cutbacks are forthcoming in this year and projected for next year and beyond.	(Sister institution of above in Urban area)

TABLE 3

Summary of Categorical Resources,
First and Second Surveys

	Downsizing	Eroding	Treading	Enhancing	No Response
1st Survey 7/82	14	25	23	19	38
2nd Survey 1/83	9	32	34	13	31

A total of 64 institutions (54%) responded to both surveys (see Table 3). Of these, 19 institutions indicated a deterioration in categorical status, 13 indicated improvement, and 31 indicated no change. Of new respondents--those responding to the January, 1983 survey but not to the July, 1982 request--two indicated "Downsizing", nine "Eroding", nine "Treading", and five "Enhancing". Of the 32 institutions indicating some change in status from the July, 1982 to the January, 1983 surveys, 19 moved down (-) in status and 13 moved up (+), as shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Summary of Changes in Status,
First to Second Survey

DOWN (-)	UP (+)
Treading to Eroding = 8	Eroding to Treading = 7
Enhancing to Treading = 8	Downsizing to Treading = 1
Eroding to Downsizing = 2	Treading to Enhancing = 3
Enhancing to Eroding = 1	Downsizing to Eroding = 2

Immediately after our initial visits and discussions with deans and other administrative officers of universities, it was obvious to us that the resources necessary to support the legitimate missions of SCDEs were most precarious. Our original sentiment, as contained in the preliminary report, was as follows:

> That there is a general and pervasive fiscal crisis in SCDE's and, for that matter, in just about all aspects of universities is not arguable...that thereare widespread resource constraints and that these are very serious is beyond dispute.

After the second survey and subsequent discussions, we have no reason to change that observation; it is clear to us that fiscal difficulties are indeed pervasive. Certainly it is true that some institutions are nicely holding their own and a few--a very few--are increasing their resource base. However, few are now enjoying relative affluence. For the most part, resources are deteriorating; and those institutions holding their own have indicated that their situations are tenuous at best. The data

presented thus far amply support that melancholy view. Of the 64 institutions responding to the surveys, 73% indicated that their status was either the same or worse than six months earlier. Twenty percent (20%) indicated an improvement in status; but it should be noted that among those, only four institutions indicated what might be considered a significant improvement in status (i.e., from "Downsizing" to "Treading" or from "Treading" to "Enhancing"). The other nine institutions moved from a condition of "Downsizing" to "Eroding" or from "Eroding" to "Treading". These are hardly changes in status to cheer about. Of those institutions indicating a deterioration in circumstances, nine moved away from the "Enhancing" category they had enjoyed in July, 1982. Consequently, we reassert that a general condition of fiscal deterioration in SCDE's is beyond dispute.

Major Observations

Considering the overall responses to the survey by the 24 institutions visited and the face validity of the information reported to us, especially in light of our intensive conversations with deans, faculty, and central administrative officers, we submit the following observations as reasonable conclusions about the general nature of the problem.

General Circumstance

Based on data provided from the membership of the association, fiscal problems are even more critical as of 1983 than six months earlier, considering the number of institutions

not included in the campus visits. For example, only 14 of 119 institutions (12%) included on the mailing list did not respond to either survey; of the 105 others who did respond, 64 (62%) responded to both surveys. Of those institutions visited, all responded to either or both surveys. Thus, the data suggest that if we had had opportunity and resources to visit all institutions, our conclusions regarding circumstances would probably not change very much.

We therefore conclude that there are widespread resource constraints and that these are very serious, and that in a large number of cases Schools and Colleges of Education have taken a more serious blow in regard to resource cutbacks than have most other academic units in such institutions. Although a number of Education units in universities have encountered reductions in enrollment, in some cases especially so at undergraduate level, it is our considered judgment that the magnitude of resource cuts has been substantially greater than the enrollment deterioration would otherwise warrant.

Planning

In the main, we found that SCDE's and the universities within which they function have not engaged in the type of planning that is helpful in the face of significant fiscal reductions. On the contrary, with very few exceptions the overall sophistication of planning with reference to fiscal affairs leaves us unimpressed. Especially is that the case when it comes to forecasting the extent and nature of difficulties caused by fiscal restraints and with regard to lessening the

impact of arbitrary decisions for fiscal cutbacks by Governors and legislatures. In the latter case, the general pattern of recisions has taken the form of unilateral mandates for all state agencies to cut their budgets by a given percentage. Typically, the state demands the return of a specific number of dollars; and institutions then pass along a proportional "tax" to all academic units. This means that in early stages of difficulty, all units must cut equal proportions from their budgets. Little or no consideration is given, then, to priorities for enhancing good programs or pruning bad ones.

Most institutions were caught off guard by state cut-back mandates. In the majority of cases, planning was almost routinely based on an assumption of growth, or catch-up from previous bad years. Typically, institutions were prepared only to demonstrate their need for more, not ready to make a case for less resources.

One university we visited had developed a quite sophisticated planning process. The process involved faculty and administrators in budget committees and councils throughout the university, was based on carefully articulated planning assumptions, and was a significant aspect of the entire budget-planning and budget-request system. Budget assumptions were based on the expansion of services and programs or recapturing resources that had fallen far short of previous years. The notion that already inadequate budgets could possibly be further reduced, including midyear recisions and reversions, was not considered. Yet that is precisely what happened in four

successive years.

Another university, on the other hand, had developed an equally comprehensive planning system which took into consideration the possibility or probability of fiscal reverses. Several other institutions were forced to have mature planning mechanisms that are helpful in the general process of budget management. Some planning mechanisms are a consequence of the recognition that the absence of planning is even worse than bad planning. One institution we visited was able to face significant economic crisis and, over time, to prune its programs but retain strong thrusts in many areas. Another university anticipated several years ago the need for comprehensive program analyses and was thus far ahead of most institutions when program reduction was required. Among major private, comprehensive universitites, one we visited faced quite serious fiscal resource problems in the early 1970s, when most large public universities were still enjoying affluence; its overall university response not only averted fiscal disaster, but most of its programs emerged stronger and more vital.

Notwithstanding isolated success stories, the fact remains that too many institutions tend to function with very inadequate and often inaccurate information in the face of crisis. Thus deans' councils or other administrative bodies meet in confrontation of an immediate fiscal mandate and without a dependable record of qualitative and quantitative arguments that favor rational decisions about strengths and weaknesses. Unfortunately, idiosyncratic responses to mandated cutbacks tend to favor the weaker and indecisive academic deans at the expenses

of the more competent managers. For example, in one particular case, an able and competent education dean was able, by virtue of his own rather sophisticated in-house information and planning system, to advise his vice president within the allotted time limits that he could manage a reversion of about $250,000; and while it was altogether painful and probably destructive of quality, he could do it. "Wonderful," said the vice president with tongue-in cheek, "I've got a guy over in fine arts who can't seem to get his act together at all, and this will bail him out!" Despite the humor, the point is that under circumstances in which there is so little analysis of the implications of cuts it is not at all unlikely that effective managers will be penalized and victimized by the incompetent ones. There is little evidence in any of the systems we examined to suggest that systematic punitive measures are leveled against incompetence in favor of the effective and competent manager. The latter tends to take a painful "hit" as a consequence of competence! The overall quality of planning tends to pit dean against dean rather than to encourage all units to circle the wagons and man the barricades.

Another important problem in short-range planning is that impulsive decisions are sometimes made about marginal programs. A situation in one of the major comprehensive southeastern universities, in which all undergraduate education programs were unilaterally eliminated, comes to mind. The aftermath was stormy indeed. In not a few such cases, the administration has to reconsider its initial decision, yet the damage of that previous decision has already been done. And

backing off from decisions leads, obviously, to lack of confidence in the administration.

Rigorous and analytical new modes of planning are needed. Such planning must take into consideration the fundamental missions of the institution. In the planning process, some programs must be regarded as "untouchable" regardless of circumstances or relationship to other units, even if it means "going public" to maintain their integrity. Decisions on such issues must precede mandated budget cuts. It should be clear to every academic dean what level of support each of his or her programs will receive under various fiscal conditions. As one vice-president told one of the investigators; "We already know that we are not only going to sustain most of the programs in the school of education but we are going to strengthen six of them; we also know that we are not going to support some programs in other areas, and we have good data rationales for living with that decision." This kind of confidence in administrative decisions is a function of good planning and information, whether short or long range. Finally in this regard, we can say that nothing was more clear to us than the fact that where there is good and reliable information, deans, vice-presidents, and faculty councils are always more comfortable with decisions.

The Information Environment

At every institution we visited and in our various conversations with deans and university and collegiate administrators, the status and dependability of the information

environment was an important topic. One must conclude that most institutions have very weak information systems and that different sources in the universities' administrative structures frequently offer contradictory information. At one institution, an investigator was told that calls could be made to four different on-campus sites requesting information about the institution's enrollment--and one would get four different answers. At another university an interviewer was told of a call to the university's office of personnel rquesting the number of classified employees under contract. The personnel office responded that such information would have to come from the office of institutional research, to which the caller replied, "This is the office of institutional research!" Few institutions we visited felt either confidence or satisfaction that the information environment was dependably helpful in providing data and conclusions necessary to the planning that is vital to any truly mature institutional redirection and to programmatic accountability.

We have hunches about why the information environment in universities is often chaotic. The relatively flat (as opposed to hierarchical) authority structure, whereby faculties enjoy somewhat greater influence than would be the case for technical level personnel in other types of organizations may be an important factor. Moreover, the tendency for decentralized ownership of the enterprise at the level of academic units may contribute to the problem.

It is pleasant to report that at collegiate levels, schools and colleges of education in larger number were praised

by central academic officers for their own reasonably sophisticated information systems. Only business and engineering schools were mentioned frequently as being competent in this area. There is little question that in a number of cases potential and even anticipated program reductions in education units were reconsidered as a consequence of education deans' highly developed information sources.

Given that the information structure in institutions of higher education often is chaotic, colleges and universities must place greater priority on the application of scarce resources to the improvement and efficiency of institutional research. In SCDE's, the same prescription applies; a first-rate information program will have high pay-offs over time and is an increasingly essential dimension of administrative overhead. Deans need to find ways of squeezing resources into information systems, sometimes even at the expense of what may seem more pressing priorities.

Faculty Concerns and Involvement

Curiously, most faculty members at most institutions, even the ones enduring nationally visible reductions, were generally not truly apprehensive about the impact of resource constraints, except with reference to losses in professional benefits like travel and supplies and other current expense items. There was, indeed, a pervasive mood of depression. But real apprehension as a consequence of impending loss of jobs, pay cuts, and other such crucial effects were generally absent. Our conversations with representatives of faculty may most surely

have been with the wrong people (i.e., we perhaps should have been talking with the non-tenured assistant professors rather than the more influential professors). The mood, however, seemed to be that while things are tough, the professoriate is still reasonably free to maintain its prerogatives. This view was generally supported by most of the administrators with whom we talked; as one put it, "...after all, why should the faculty be apprehensive--we always manage, somehow, to save them from that kind of authentic disaster."

We believe that this sentiment is accurate. In almost every case, the protection of faculty status was a very high priority among central academic officers who, we think rightly, believed that the fundamental protection of the professoriate is the significant measure of the integrity of the institution.

Still, a strong conviction is held by many faculty that things are not quite so bad as they seem. In the case of one vice-president, this point was dramatically brought home when he suggested that the hardest thing about making any kind of budget cut is convincing people that it's necessary. In that regard as well, many faculty are still most unwilling to admit that changes of any kind must be made and seem still to believe that any popularization of programs that might attract greater numbers of students is not applicable to their areas and not appropriate to their own status. Special education programs were the most frequently cited. These faculties seem to believe that their programs are immune to market competition. For example, they may require far more for first-practice certification than is

required in four year colleges offering the same certification; and even as their enrollments decline, they seem to give little attention either to market factors or to the lack of evidence that students trained in one program are more or less well qualified than those trained in another. As one dean put it to one of our team, "Why in the world would a reasonably intelligent candidate pay what it costs to come here for a Master's Degree when they can go down the road and get the same thing for a lot less cost and effort; and, we haven't the foggiest notion as to whether one is all that much better than the other."

There were, nevertheless, a number of cases in which faculty were particularly well informed about resource problems. In our conversations with faculty in one of the plains states' institutions, for example, a professor spoke of the steady erosion in resources during her 10 years at the institution. She cited the lack of funds for support of student teacher supervision and the difficulties in being able to provide the necessary quality of experiences that teachers in training required merely to be abreast of what was current and useful. She was well informed about the procedures and criteria used by administrators for making program reductions, and she pointed out that the process was very upsetting to faculty. She was convinced that some of the better ones among her professional colleagues would unquestionably seek positions elsewhere. It was interesting that while agreeing with the general criteria being used, she felt that the central administration had made "...dataless judgements against the criteria." She felt, however, that the central administration's actions probably would

work to the advantage of the college of education. She suggested that as a consequence of reactions to proposed cuts in the college reported by the press she had been confronted by students, who were so upset that she had to use an entire class period merely to respond to questions and try to describe the relevant administrative processes. In this particular circumstance, the threat of cuts, which had not previously received much open discussion, had brought students, faculty, and field professionals very much together.

In the case of that particular institution, the magnitude of the prescribed reductions was so far beyond any reasonable expectations that in the process of their being publicized the college discovered it had a much more impressive support base in the state than it had presumed. As events progressed, the college was able to forestall extensive reductions. That professor turned out to be correct--the situation brought together a strong coterie of students, faculty, and practitioners in the state.

The Graduate-Undergraduate Dilemma

The general mood and attitudes of faculty gave us considerable reason to concur with some of the observations of Professor Harry Judge of Oxford University in his Ford Foundation subsidized study of American Graduate Schools of Education.[1] The

---

[1]Harry Judge. American Graduate Schools of Education: A View from Abroad. Ford Foundation, July, 1982.

major conclusion of his study was that too many graduate Education programs have little or no direct relationship with the field of practice; they too seldom consider such a relationship particularly relevant. Their preoccupation is research about education and knowledge-production activities related to the preparation of academic educators rather than the quality and nature of educational practice. Judge's view is also supported by much publicized statements and events of the summer of 1982 focusing on the roles of the schools of education at two well-recognized institutions--Stanford University and the University of California-Berkeley. In both cases, the message was clear, that "flagship" institutions with strong and traditionally visible national reputations in education must become much more involved with the field of practice.

In our conversations with a number of administrators in the major comprehensive institutions we visited, this issue did come up, and there were mixed views about it. Education deans, in most cases, expressed serious concerns about the prospect of decisions that might limit SCDE's to a primary or even an exclusive emphasis on graduate programs. This notion was mentioned in a number of cases by vice-presidents, who seemed to feel that undergraduate teacher education activities could be more effectively handled by four-year state and private undergraduate colleges in their areas, thus eliminating much of the duplication and competition for increasingly scarce resources.

In some of the institutions we visited, fiscal resources allocated to undergraduate programs were already declining. In a few cases, this was a consequence of declining enrollments in undergraduate teacher education due to demographic changes and decreasing demands for teachers. Higher tuition and fees at comprehensive universities was also a factor. Universities have, in some cases, increased their requirements for certification to the MA degree, whereas four-year institutions offer the same certification at the baccalaureate level.

It is clear to us that chief academic officers at state universities differ markedly in the importance they attach to their colleges of education. Some value them very highly. These chief academic officers tend to view the various levels of education as closely related to each other. Good elementary and secondary schools prepare young people to be good college and university students as well as good members of society, and good teacher education programs prepare their students to be good elementary and secondary teachers; bad schools and programs likewise prepare their students inadequately. Academic officers with this set of perceptions tended also to realize that, although prospective teachers take most of their course work in the arts and sciences, they also have a substantial block of professional courses. Thus, this group of academic officers seemed to strive both to build strong colleges of education and to enhance the relationships between their education and their arts and sciences programs.

Although many chief academic officers placed great importance on their colleges of education, others considered them to be of little value; some even appeared to think of them as an embarrassment to the university. Such officials tended to perceive education, and the rest of society, as a set of semi-independent compartments. Within education, compartments might be grades K-12; a state college; undergraduate program in sciences, humanities, and engineering; and a Ph.D. program. The K-12 and state college compartments are somewhat related, as are the strong undergraduate and the Ph.D. program, but the former is virtually unrelated to the latter; it is almost as if good freshmen students are born as bright, well informed eighteen-year-olds! These academic officers have little interest in or respect for the scholarship of professional educators. Because they do not perceive any particular relationship between K-12 schools and the university and because it is easier and more fun to complain about the product that K-12 schools are foisting on society than it is to try to help them improve, these officials simply tolerate, or try to eliminate, their colleges of education rather than seek to make them better or, at least, to eliminate the undergraduate components of them.

Additional Observations

Other concerns and problems and possible initiatives came out of our conversations. Without extended comment about these further matters, we briefly provide some observations regarding them. In some cases, these observations touch on some of the notions we have discussed above.

- Much consideration, or at least speculation, is being given to expansion into new program areas. That is, the familiar notion of the human services market is alive and well. Some of these considerations are not very well conceived; they seem to reflect, instead, a grasping for any potential new sources of collegiate support.
- No matter what may happen, the rigid structure of many institutions makes it very difficult to do much about the budgeting system (e.g., the extensiveness of union contracts and other similar absolutes leaves administrators with so few degrees of freedom that even with very thoughtful and well-advised program redefinitions there is not enough money to give good ideas much chance).
- While education programs have seemed to endure so-called heavy hits, we need to be reminded that during the years when education was in great demand and we were trying very hard to meet critical needs we did so in a prosperous and expanding economy with an always increasing Gross National Product. Now, engineering and business and computer competency are the primary needs. Demand in these areas now occurs during a time when the economy is depressed and the GNP is level at best. Vice presidents politely called this occasionally to our attention.
- There do not seem to be any obvious, natural, or easy answers to the big problems facing education. All

aspects of higher education are much more rigidly anchored in a cultural milieu than we have admitted even to ourselves; and change is almost automatically designed to be more and bigger rather than less and smaller. Turning that around very much at all will cause great pain, and it is not the nature of education to inflict any real pain.

- In almost any academic corner of any major university, whether in the business schools or the humanities and the sciences, there is a substantial opinion that the preparation of education personnel is not warranted if it requires much of the university's resources. On the contrary, there is a considerable opinion that a small cadre of special scholars is quite sufficient since, in the universities, education faculty themselves openly demonstrate that they would prefer to study education and teachers rather than practice the former and train the latter.
- Some of the problems of universities' education programs are increasingly exacerbated by a still more substantial opinion, curiously shared by liberals and conservatives alike, that preparation in the education school adds very little to the skills of teachers. While that opinion has always been held by some people and has always been an irritant to educationists, it comes now at a time when there is keener competition

for scarce dollars and could have a more critical effect.

- And finally, along similar lines, there are basic ideological conflicts between the purists in arts and sciences and the proponents of professional schools in research univeristies. These conflicts emerge at critical times, such as when resources need to be reduced or reconsideration of the criteria upon which allocations will be made is necessary. The lesser professional schools, which include education, suffer the most in those circumstances.

Some Illustrative Representations of Type

The investigative team believed it would be useful to present several brief case studies reasonably representative of a variety of the circumstances we encountered. We have deliberately masked the identities of particular institutions. In fact each case study represents an amalgamation of specific institutions that share similar problems.

Case Study #1

On the campus of Modern University the ever-present differences in the concept of what a research university should be emerged into open conflict as the result of declining resources. The roles and contributions of professional schools came increasingly into question, particularly by faculty not involved in them. The university faculty organization had great influence on the control of resource allocations, program

evaluation, planning, and other factors relative to the health and future of the schools and colleges. The central administration of the university, although not indicating opposition to professional schools, did not take a positive stand.

The School of Education had been struggling to maintain its mission as a professional school. Evaluations of graduate programs, conducted by the Graduate School using criteria applicable to purely academic programs, identified deviations which were interpreted as weaknesses and indications of inferior quality. A similar evaluation of the basic professional program produced similar results.

The School of Education was continually forced into defensiveness about its mission and programs. Faculty were divided over the role of the School. Several deans, over a period of years, had either given in to the pressures on campus or had resigned. Many of the attempts to respond to campus politics had resulted in a marred image of the School by public school leaders and in their reduced concern and backing. The prestige and importance of the School, both on and off campus, had deteriorated to the point that university decision makers considered its elimination the easiest and best answer.

In a survey of other schools of education conducted by the advocates of the School, it was discovered that many other schools had experienced the same problems. The salvation of those that had survived had been specific actions taken by individuals or power blocs who were advocates of a professional school of education.

Examples of Actions Taken:

Inst. A. The public school leaders organized education groups and mounted such a strong campaign for the school that it re-emerged as strong or stronger.

Inst. B. The president took a strong positive stand, appointed a strong dean as an indication, and provided the necessary backing.

Inst. C. A new president publicly took a strong advocate position and personally became involved in the reconstruction both on and off campus.

Inst. D. The provost, who had been either uninterested in or opposed to professional schools, resigned and the replacement turned out to be an advocate.

Inst. E. The faculty of education, realizing they had been playing into the hands of the opponents of the school, reunited behind a plan for the future of the school.

Case Study #2

On the campus of Contemporary University, there has been a general perception that the School of Education is weak. With periodic changes in central academic leadership and a similar succession of education deans, there was neither serious nor consistent concern for what the college ought to be doing. Some of the areas of exceptional quality for which it had gained recognition had also begun to deteriorate.

Although the university had not encountered such severe fiscal reductions as similar institutions, due to a favorable economic climate in its region, the School of Education had not enjoyed any increases in resources. Some senior members of the faculty saw this as a consequence of lack of leadership, both in the school and in the university. Moreover, as younger faculty left, replacements were of acknowledged marginal quality. Too

many were recruited from graduates of the institution itself or of its sister institutions in the state; the rare outside appointment came from a neighboring state university.

The situation was ripe for a decision as to whether the school should continue as a major academic unit within the university. But with the appointment of an aggressive vice president for academic affairs, who believed that a state's major university ought to have a significant and influential presence in professional education, the situation began to turn around. An able dean was named who came to the position with three major commitments: 1) that all programs in the school must undergo a rigorous and systematic evaluation, the intent being that those having appropriate strength, those necessary to the maintenance of personnel preparation, and those showing promise of improvement would be targeted for retention and significant support, while others would be phased out; 2) that faculty recruitment must be national in scope for the purpose of seeking much more potentially productive and competent persons and that salaries must be elevated commensurate with such personnel recruitment; and, 3) that the funding necessary to realize these purposes must be forthcoming from the central administration.

Internal analyses of all aspects of the school were indicated, including reviews of all faculty and staff and program management (admissions, student recruitment, and academic administration). Three outside and highly recognized consultants were brought to the school, met with various members of the faculty and administration, and provided separate reports to the dean and vice president. Special ad hoc committees of alumni and

representatives of important constituencies were also convened and provided additional recommendations. At the end of the first year of the new dean's tenure, the central administration increased the SOE budget by $500,000 to indicate its support of the program for excellence that was well underway. Throughout these early revitalization efforts, the emphasis on more rigorous standards and on strengthening all programs that had come through the evaluations with promising results were the hallmarks of the process. The test of the commitment came in the third year of planning when the university began to confront some of the same sorts of funding reductions that were widespread elsewhere; even though the SOE had to return a small percentage of its operating budget, its planning and its course of action were sustained and its new program thrusts were protected. Accordingly, the morale of the faculty showed a marked improvement even though the revitalization had certainly created some casualties along the way. Recruitment of needed staff on a national basis and with the purpose of gaining potentially productive and visible people was beginning to have the kind of pay-off envisioned.

This case is a prime example of the effectiveness of needed changes when there are:

1) Initial commitment to maintain and support a strong school of education;

2) agreement on the kinds of initiatives necessary to achieve excellence;

3) willingness of academic administrators to support strong leadership and effective planning;

4) the necessary allocation of the additional funds required to carry through on initiatives;

5) recognition that changing marginal or even mediocre programs necessiates difficult personnel decisions and that these will be made with great care but will be supported; and

6) enlightened and aggressive leadership in the central administration as well as in the dean's office.

Case Study #3

The School of Education at Current State University, along with all other major academic colleges, has undergone a series of budget reductions over a period of six years beginning in 1977. All of the budget reductions in each of the first three years of the "down" cycle have been across-the-board (i.e., each major unit had absorbed a cut of 3.5% to 5% in each of those years). During those years, and beginning two years earlier, the SOE had also endured the disadvantage of successive enrollment decreases--from 700+ undergraduates in 1975 to only about 300 by the fall term, 1983. While graduate enrollments had remained fairly stable during most of the 1970s, although with a very slight decline toward the end of the decade, beginning in 1981 graduate enrollment in the SOE had taken a surprising turn upward--from about 650 in 1979 to 800 in 1983. These graduate enrollment data were prominent in budget discussions. The dean argued almost endlessly that these data were misleading, that the bulk of the increases in graduate enrollments were MA students. The enrollments were a consequence of a new governance policy

requiring more of the middle-level graduate work for education personnel to be offered through a more liberalized off-campus policy and the pressures of this expansion, which required much more effort on the part of an already depleted faculty. The faculty had been spread increasingly thin as a consequence of the budget reductions, since most of that had been accomplished by attrition. The dean was able to demonstrate that doctoral level admissions had changed little over a period of 10 years and that the general effect of the expanded MA services was further exacerbating the SOE's ability to service the doctoral program properly. The doctoral program had always enjoyed an excellent reputation, but it was now creating critical problems in staffing the kind of high quality undergraduate teacher education program that Current State had worked very hard to develop over a period of many years.

These arguments were particularly critical in the events that had occurred after 1979, when it had become obvious that overall budget reductions were simply no longer possible for the institution to effect. The vice-president for academic affairs had used the cliche about "shooting with the rifle" until all the deans were making jokes of it. But the fact remained that Current State could simply no longer meet its budget targets without a much more analytical and program-focused plan; unfortunately, it had no organized system for determining which programs ought to be salvaged and which programs ought to be eliminated.

It was in these circumstances that both of the SOE dean's earlier arguments came back to haunt him. His faculty had shrunk from 87 full time tenure-stream people to only 58, and undergraduate enrollment was down by well over 50% in a period of about eight years. Given his own arguments that the graduate needs could not continue to be adequately serviced otherwise, a proposition began to gain increasing credibilitiy in central administration as well as among a number of the members of the dean's council: eliminate all undergraduate teacher education in the SOE and let it concentrate on graduate work. This alternative gained considerable support for a number of reasons: First, 11 other four-year state colleges in the state were primarily in the "teacher education business," and they could very adequately serve the undergraduate teacher education needs of the state and region; second, the institution faced critical funding shortfalls, and regardless of the worth or integrity of <u>any</u> program, all had to be reviewed against <u>some</u> kind of alternative; third, the faculty in the SOE had demonstrated over a number of years and in a variety of ways that their interests were much better served in the graduate area; and fourth, the quality of undergraduate matriculants in the SOE was demonstrably and unarguably near the bottom, so far as test scores and other factors related to that issue were concerned. In a meeting with the dean, the vice president pointed out these facts and added as well that it made little sense for the major state university to continue to try to compete with the smaller colleges in a field in which the latter obviously had all the advantages and in which it apparently made no difference one way or the other where one

completed the requirements for teacher certification. Why, the vice president argued, don't we go ahead and try to do the things we can do well rather than fight this kind of losing battle? Why shouldn't your school recognize the marvelous opportunities here for research about teaching and education and continue with the preparation of those persons whose credentials require a graduate degree. After all, she argued (using the dean's own data) promotion and tenure in the SOE demand the same kind of record of research and publication as any other college, and your people have objected for years that with their professional monitoring responsibilities they are at a disadvantage. If we change the emphasis to a graduate school of education, these concerns will be resolved.

This proposition elicited the following reactions from the dean:

1) While there is a face-value logic to this alternative, is it appropriate in every sense of the idea for the major state university to discontinue all undergraudate teacher preparation?

2) What reasonable guarantees are there that the record of deterioration of recent budgets would change if we were to go to graduate enrollments only? After all, it is clearly recognized that graduate education, if done even moderately well (and the dean argues that recent budget cuts have had a negative impact on graduate quality, as well as on undergraduate programs) is still more costly than undergraduate education.

3) What would such a change do to all those young persons who have already indicated an interest in or elected

teacher education?

4) Shouldn't such a major change in academic function deserve very careful study over a reasonable period of time so that all the issues which cannot even be thought of momentarily are given serious consideration?

5) Who can say that if the SOE had been more adequately funded through the past several years our programs would not have been more attractive and more effective? There is, after all, a real basis for the presumption that lack of support is a matter of administrative priorities.

6) What other serious alternatives have been considered prior to the promulgation of this one? Have all other programs been assessed in terms of their contributions to the functions and missions of the state university? Do we need a struggling school of social work? Do we need a center for the Study of wheat-germ pathology? Do we need to continue doctoral programs in the humanities when it is acknowledged that between 1974 and 1985 we will have provided 52,600 Ph.D.'s for only 9,100 jobs?

Case Study #4

At Comprehensive State University there has been a rather long period of almost perpetual confusion about the whole budget process. In the midst of that seemingly chaotic environment, the School of Education has had to manuever its own needs and problems through a process of budgetary procedures that would put Houdini into an inescapable circumstance. Yet here is a school of education with a national and even international

reputation as one of the best among all state universities and whose graduates and faculty are recognized literally far-and-wide.

This case merely treats a process, and within its pattern there may be much for all of us to learn. The issue began, innocently enough, when some obscure member of the board of trustees simply asked how the university's budget came to be developed! Here's the way it was described.

Comprehensive State's planning and budgeting process is an aggregation of events which go on simultaneously throughout the fiscal year in many areas and at many levels of the University. The cycle begins with the budget task force, chaired by the president, setting forth the parameters and principles on which the operating and capital budgets are formulated and guiding the development of the process. Early in the annual cycle a calendar of major budget events describing the key activities and decision points in the planning and budgeting process is prepared and distributed to all executives and budget administrators.

Preliminary work on developing the annual state appropriation request is typically underway in July, before the current year's operating budget is fully implemented. The budget task force carefully reviews the university's needs and resources and establishes the general level of the appropriation request to the state. Following approval of the proposed request by the board of trustees in September, the request is submitted to the higher education authority and a formal hearing is conducted.

Following release of the governor's budget recommendations about February 1 of each year, the university prepares its budget presentation based on its initial request to the higher education authority and the governor's recommended budget. The president then uses this presentation at hearings before the House of Representatives and the Senate. Upon passage of an appropriation by both houses of the legislature, the governor's approval and signature are required for the university's appropriation to be authorized. The university, in light of the decisions of the legislature and governor, again reviews its requirements and priorities for augmentation and retrenchment, salary increases, and tuition levels as part of the development of the operating budget presentation prepared for the board of trustees in July.

The five year plan and budget process begins in the late summer and early fall with the revision of the university's five-year budget projections,which also serve as a key component in the development of the university's appropriation request. Also at this time revisions, if any, to the budgetary recycling targets and the new fifth year targets of the various administrative units of the university are determined. Planning questions are developed for each administrative unit, data packages presenting the historical and current program and productivity measures are updated, and, together with the revised targets, are distributed to the unit's administrative officer. While these materials are being developed centrally, faculty and staff members at the department and division levels in both academic and nonacademic administrative areas are considering

their planning directions and budgetary needs for the ensuing fiscal year.

During the winter term, the provost, the senior vice presidents for finance and operations and for administration, and the provost of the medical center conduct a series of hearings with those academic and administrative units reporting to them to discuss the planning parameters and budgetary requests of these units. Each unit's program goals and performance, its enrollments and resource requirements, and its plans for meeting assessed budgetary targets are discussed at length.

Each senior officer has an advisory hearing group or committee which participates in these planning and budget deliberations. The involvement of committee members and the commitment of individuals to such a time-consuming task is considerable. Over the past 12 months, 34 planning sessions and hearings were held by these advisory panels, consuming nearly 100 hours. Despite the many hours both in meetings and in preparation, these hearings are deemed highly beneficial. In remarks made at last month's meeting of the university faculty senate, a faculty representative on the provost's advisory committee for planning and budget stated that ". . . the most interesting evolution of this Committee has been its shift from a Committee primarily interested in (the details of) budget and budget reallocation to a Committee that concerns itself with the widest possible range of planning (and budget) problems . . ."

In February, the president and the budget task force, which also monitors the university's operating budget throughout

the year, consider overall planning priorities in developing the initial budget alternatives for the ensuing fiscal year and decide the planning and budget parameters for constructing the initial operating budget. The budget alternatives subsequently are refined to consider various options regarding tuition, salary and fringe benefit increases, program needs, inflation and other external factors, and proposed budgetary reallocations.

At the conclusion of the planning and budget hearings, the senior university officers develop their respective budgetary recommendations and present them to the president and the budget task force early in the spring. With the budgetary recommendations from the senior university officers in hand, the president and budget task force consider priorities and program needs and recycling and reallocations among the major academic and administrative divisions of the university. Ultimately, one alternative is selected which is then used to develop the initial operating budget.

Concurrently, plans are being made for development of the budgets for the medical center, including the college of medicine and the university hospital. These budgets proposed by the provost of the medical center are reviewed at the university-wide level in consultation with the president, the senior vice president for finance and operations, the vice president and controller, and the director of the office of planning and budget.

During this period in which various budget alternatives are being developed and considered, the president consults with officers of the board of trustees and officers of the finance

committee of the board on key budgetary parameters. Prior to the presentation of the proposed budget in July to the entire board, an extensive review is held with the president and vice president of the board, the chairman and vice chairman of the finance committee, and the chairman of the medical advisory committee.

In order that executives and budget administrators may begin to prepare for the new fiscal year, the senior university officers inform them of decisions regarding tentative budgetary allocations, permanent and temporary recycling shares, and fifth year targets by late in April. Special consideration regarding tentative allocations is given to some academic units as early as December or January in order that adequate lead time may be provided for recruiting faculty members to fill additional positions which will be allocated to the unit as a result of the year's reallocations. With the knowledge of their probable budgets, budget administrators may proceed with prospective hirings and plans for carrying forward programs for the coming fiscal year, albeit tentatively.

The preparation for and meetings of the budget task force and other central advisory committees are considerable. However, these activities merely represent the tip of the iceberg when one considers the planning which goes on at the department, college, and campus levels and in the many other administrative areas of the university. Out of this reiterative process emerge the planning priorities of the university and the budgetary allocations which best support these priorities.

Ultimately, the various aspects of the planning and budgeting process of the university all come together in May or June of each year. Passage and adoption of the appropriation by the legislature and governor by the end of June permit the university to present the operating budget to the board of trustees for approval in July. Needless to say, those deadlines are sometimes not met.

The process leading up to the board's adoption of a budget is comprehensive and thorough, and although it has been devised to consider equitably all programs and constituencies of the university, and to provide the board of trustees with an effective budgetary plan for operating the university for the ensuing fiscal year, the process itself is cumbersome. Sometimes much is lost in the process. If you're in a significant administrative role in this university, budgeting preoccupies you totally. A flow-chart of the budget process discloses that there are 28 separate "events" involved! An observation by the dean of the school of education is instructive: "We have been involved in a five-year 'rolling' budget and planning process since about 1977, thus it is becoming somewhat repetitious; that's particularly the case anymore since there are two recurring themes annually--substantial budget cuts despite inflation or recession, and continued justification of our (S.O.E.'s) existence even though we are a cost effective operation. But, then, what else is new?"

Case Study #5

From its origins in the early 19th century, Venerable University seemed to prosper. It began as a deliberate alternative to the more aristocratic and theocratic universities of the time, and it was explicitly intended to provide opportunities for students from all segments of society including "...sons of merchants, farmers, and mechanics." Privately chartered, it opened in 1831.

Over the period of its first 50 years, it had established programs in law, engineering, commerce (later named business and public administration), and a graduate school. By 1900, it had also moved effectively into programming for a variety of professional interests, among which was the establishment in 1890 of a school of pedagogy, the first of its kind in any major public or private university.

Situated in the heart of a great city, it was caught up in the syndrome of dynamic growth and expansionism which characterized the American urban movement throughout the first half of the 20th century. But by the middle of that period of marvelous commitment to higher eduation which occurred between about 1950 and 1970, Venerable University found itself in very critical fiscal and program quality difficulties. It had somehow become the unwary victim of its own historical development of rather autonomous and decentralized collegiate entities. By 1960 it was almost a collection of loosely federated academic units, each of which seemed to go its own way and chart its own destiny. Unfortunately, the fiscal structure of the enterprise could not

very well tolerate this circumstance of independence, and the total institution found itself in dire straits.

Fortunately, it was able to attract a succession of extremely able chief officers who were uniquely skillful in dealing with the particularly pressing problems that each of them, in turn, confronted. The first of these administrators confronted the critical issue of academic standards and launched a series of bold initiatives in cooperation with a few equally able and informed deans of other academic units who clearly faced the same problems. Several tactics were used to stave off impending financial crisis. Following that, internal reorganization of some programs was accomplished, consolidating curricula as well as allowing more effective control of overall standards. These efforts preceded the later and more general fiscal difficulties that the majority of American public and private univerities began to confront in the late 1970s.

When the first of these very able presidents assumed office, the school of education--which about 1921 had superceded the original school of pedogogy--had an undergraduate enrollment of well over 3,000 students. As its current dean pointed out, they did not possess the greatest academic aptitude. "As a matter of fact," he commented, "the average SAT score of those folks was in the 400's when the national average was well above 500 and, moreover, the other undergraduate schools and programs were not any better off." Certainly there was widespread interest in overall standards and quality, but there was still a major recognition that the various schools and colleges were largely independent entities. During this period, it is

instructive to note that a new dean of the graduate school of arts and sciences, who was somewhat appalled by what he perceived to be low quality doctoral candidates, initiated his own study. But as the results came in, he said nothing, since his own doctoral students looked worse than most. Prior to this time, the school of education had already set about putting that part of its own house in order and had, with some pain, established a GRE cut-off score of at least 1,000 for admission.

Nevertheless, prior to this new president's accession, all of the various academic undergraduate programs had developed their own liberal arts components, and each was going its own way. One of the first things that was done was to establish a single such program. Interestingly, this change was largely accomplished merely by administrative fiat; little a priori discussion of it was held, nor were there any alternative opinions considered. This president just decreed it, called the major deans involved together and said in effect that it certainly seemed the better part of logic to have one good liberal arts program rather than several mediocre ones. Since this struck some of the deans as an idea that they also agreed with, it merely remained for them to work out some of the procedural problems. Among those who thought this was a good idea was the dean of the school of education. He assumed some of the leadership in implementing the new configuration.

Subsequently, and in rapid succession, the admission requirements for undergraduates were significantly elevated--to at least the national average on the SAT, which was, by then,

1,000. And a hard new look was taken at the university's athletic programs,which were dramatically cut back. This had an elevating effect on academic performance. The athletic program had enjoyed the same autonomy as academic programs and had, predictably, treated that responsibility with little regard.

During the several years that these significant changes were being undertaken, the entire funding structure of the university was increasingly hard-pressed. There was already a drying up of the federal largesse; and with more stringent academic standards there was grumbling among alumni and donors. Tuition hikes during that time had added somewhat to the university's difficulties with its public relations. Nevertheless, many of the academic units maintained their independence in fiscal and managerial affairs and tended to spend more than cost-effective prudence would otherwise dictate. And while some deans were more prudent than others in the face of the obvious implications of more stringent academic standards, all tended to suffer, at least to some extent, from the excesses of a few. In the school of education, for example, the more stringent new requirements resulted in dramatic reductions in enrollment--from more than 3,000 just five years earlier to about 1,100 by the time the new requirements were effected. In an institution where tuition and fees are major sources of revenue, this was a substantial problem, even though the more rigorous standards were strongly supported in the SOE.

By the early 1970s it was increasingly clear that the overall financial stabilitiy of Venerable University was in very

great difficulty. A number of immediate steps were taken to soften the circumstance. Deans were called into conference and briefed on the severity of the problems. They were clearly advised of a policy that necessitated "each tub on its own bottom." Involved were a series of financial moves aimed at achieving solvency. Into this cirucmstance came still another new chief executive officer with excellent skillsin fiscal management, and he immediately set about instituting financial controls and more rational budgetary processes.

While some of these controls were perceived by some deans and directors as hampering their administrative flexibilitiy, they also enabled clear understanding of prerogative. Previously, those decision-making parameters were seldom clear. A number of collegiate consolidations were effected which brought various smaller programs into larger academic configurations, enabling deans to adjust and allocate faculty dollars where they were most needed. A systematic budget process was instituted which provided much more dependable and more accurate information to deans and directors and made for much more confident decisions at all levels. It was decreed that any new program thrusts had to be fitted into one of the existing academic units; in other words, there was not much consideration given to what the education dean referred to as "the niceties" of organizational logic. If any program looked like it could grow and prosper, let it grow!

In all of these circumstances, the school of education (and its various affiliated programs) had to confront reductions of about $1 million over each of three years out of a base budget

in 1982 of about $19 million. For the majority of public institutions this may seem incredibly high, but the fact remains that cutting $3 million in three years from $19 million is just as painful as trying to cut $750,000 from a base of $5 million--what is the difference? Fifteen percent is fifteen percent.

The instructive aspect of this particular case has to do with several important considerations: First, there is significantly more flexibility and opportunity for adjusting processes of fiscal management in private universities than in public ones, if only for the reason that there are more degrees of freedom in dealing with prevailing crises; second, whether in public or private institutions, there is simply no substitute for accurate and accessible information and persons who understand it; third, there is no substitute for adequate staff in any dean's office for dealing with the various aspects of academic management. In this particular case, the dean had a very large enterprise to manage, but he had no less than six associate and/or assistant deans to help him in that complex process

The lesson of this case is that out of the near collapse of a valuable and prestigious enterprise can come lasting academic quality and fiscal stabilitiy. But there is no better example of the importance of effective and informed administrative management in academic units, nor of institutional leadership in the president's office.

Patterns of Retrenchment

Academic units react to constraints on their resources with a predictable sequence of responses. Our investigation confirms, to a large extent, the sequence described by Earl Cheit:[1]

Postponing

Belt-tightening

Cutting and reallocating

Scrambling for new funds

Planning and worrying

Postponing is usually an unproductive mode of response, but not invariably so. As one dean recalled, a delayed response to a directive for budget reductions may result in aid by central administration at the expense of those who reacted more promptly. The central administration's "bailing out" those who are unable or unwilling to do their part creates resentment and great reluctance on the part of other faculties to dealing with budget reductions.

Belt-tightening covers a variety of budget reduction strategies, from rather easy adjustments to much more serious problems. In the extreme case, the term has meant significant budget reductions for all academic units.

Definitive decisions regarding programs must be made when the process is cutting and reallocating. At this point the

---

[1]Earl Cheit. The New Depression in Higher Education. New York: Carnegie Commission, 1971. This portion of the report is largely owing to the work of George Denemark.

need for accurate information regarding programs is crucial. Deans frequently expressed to us their frustrations at having so little basis for confidence in decisions that some programs in the institution would be drastically reduced while others that seemed more logical targets for significant reduction or even elimination were apparently being left untouched. Education deans often commented that there was an absence of any satisfactory explanation regarding the central administration's rationale for its decisions. Moreover, we found in some situations that there was confusion and disagreement over the definitions of terms that are crucial to reallocation decisions. For example, in several institutions the definiti n of a "program" was unclear. Thus, not only is it hazardous to presume that a "program" is the same thing from one institutiton to the next; the term may not mean the same thing to everyone within a given institution. In several of the institutions we visited, the Ed.D. is a generic degree for which there are from a half-dozen to as many as nine different areas of concentration. Is the Ed.D. in these various circumstances a "program", or is each of the areas of concentration a "program"? Is special education a "program" or is the BS in special education a program different than the MA in special education? Under some circumstances, these questions may not have terribly weighty implications. But when there is a requirement to reduce funding for "programs" the implications are very important.

Any situation wherein there is clear evidence that budgets and resources will be reduced is accompanied by a

scramble for new funds. In the main, these efforts take two major directions. First, there is considerable revival of interest in development activities that place more burdens of responsibility on alumni giving. Second, there is greater interest in motivating faculty and staff to secure external research and service support. Neither of these thrusts has immediate predictable effect. For too long, many academic units, education among them, have not done much in the way of alumni affairs. In schools of education, the alumni operations, where they have existed at all, have been poorly staffed and funded. Moreover, as most of the deans advised, education alumni have never been much of a source of giving in any case.

Problems associated with increasing the level of funding for R & D activities from external sources are also well known. The most accessible sources of such funding have themselves confronted significant reductions. Neither the federal nor state establishments, nor public school districts themselves, are engaging in the extensive contracting that characterized them in the past.

Consequently, the major sources of additional funding for public SCDE's remains within legislatively authorized budgets. The extent to which SCDE's gain the full measure of what they deserve will be a function of their ability to engage in effective planning and convince those in power that their needs are crucial. For major private institutions, the same overall logic applies, although the targets of persuasion may be somewhat different. It is also a mistake to presume that the

major private universities enjoy a much greater source of alumni support: as one major private institution's education dean advised, "...we get charged an exorbitant amount for the alumni stuff; more than they collect."

Nevertheless, some evidence does suggest that alumni support may be more effective and hold more potential than previously assumed. The Association may want to explore further patterns of alumni affairs administration. Not only is alumni activity increasingly important in matters of extraordinary funding; it is increasingly important as well in the matter of political influence.

Criteria for Planning in Allocation Decisions

As we have previously pointed out, comprehensive systems of effective planning for program reductions and allocation decisions were not the rule in the institutions that we visited. However, few institutions had no guidelines with regard to such decisions, and some had sophisticated planning and communicating mechanisms.

When any institution reaches the point at which belt-tightening and across-the-board cutbacks simply are no longer feasible, then a much more careful and systematic rationale for program support must be developed. Such a rationale seemingly always begins with consideration for what kinds of things cannot be done and what must be done at all costs. The following were nearly universal guidelines within the institutions we visited:

1) Support of tenured faculty and for the principle of tenure itself must be sustained at all costs.

2) Proportional reductions in all programs must not be viewed as an appropriate option.

3) Principles of affirmative action must not be compromised.

4) Consideration must be given to the relevance of the unit's mission as defined by the institution or its governance structure.

5) The decision process must be effected with active involvement and communication with established faculty prerogative.[2]

Beyond these somewhat overarching guidelines, a number of additional criteria for program support have been drawn from documents in use or being readied in a number of the institutions visited:

1) Relevance to any needs-assessment analysis in the region served;

2) special mandates established by the legislature, state department of education, federal agencies, or the institution itself;

3) professional program priorities (e.g., increased emphasis on field or clinical experiences, practicum supervision);

4) program quality--indices might include integration of research and theory with practice; systematic and programmatic inquiry addressing major educational trends, issues, and problems, strength of faculty as evidenced by records of significant state and national offices held; records of effective service supporting scholarship dissemination; program rankings in surveys;

5) program interdependence--the extent to which a program serves other programs, departments, colleges, education institutions, or conversely the extent to which it is dependent upon other such programs for continued operation;

---

[2]These criteria are similar to those included in: Melchiori, G.S. "Smaller is Better: The University of Michigan Experience," Research in Higher Education, 16(1), 1982. pp. 55-69.

6) program uniqueness--assessment not only in terms of its own strengths and weaknesses but also in terms of whether being offered, or should be offered elsewhere;

7) program integration--the degree to which a program incorporates diverse theoretical and practical perspectives, is staffed by faculty who represent diversity and equity, and combines these in ways that enhance growth and development of faculty and students;

8) program currency--the extent to which the program reflects contemporary conditions and practices in a manner designed to improve them;

9) obligation for balance or comprehensiveness of offerings;

10) critical mass necessary for functioning at an appropriate level of quality;

11) provision for equity of program accessibility for women, minorities, and handicapped persons in study and employment;

12) cost effectiveness--consideration of teaching, research, and service costs relative to similar programs on campus and to similar programs of supplementary funding from other sources;

13) extramural funding potential--extent to which program impact can be extended beyond that possible through institutional funds as a result of supplementary funding from other sources.

Strategies for Coping with Declining Resources in SCDE's

It is reasonably well accepted in the literature of higher education administration that four fundamental strategies are available for dealing with budgetary constraints.[3] These involve (1) adjustments in budget standards such as raising student-faculty ratios; (2) proportioning cuts to all units--the

---

[3] See e.g., Balderston, F.E. Managing Today's University. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.

so-called shotgun approach whereby each unit shares the poverty of the total enterprise; (3) decentralizing revenue and expenditure control, making each unit more responsible for operating within its own resources or being required to be at least partially self-sustaining; and (4) differentiating budget cuts according to selective priorities.

Within our explorations, we found that these basic strategies described the general case. In addition, we observed at least the following five major types of responses within the institutions we studied.

1) Reducing proliferation of courses and programs. Decisions on instructional schedules and the frequency of course offerings are often based on the idiosyncratic interests of individual faculty members more than on college or departmental assessments of field and/or student needs. Reduced resources are causing most SCDE's to look more carefully at low enrollment courses and programs to determine whether they may be scheduled less frequently or, in some cases, eliminated.

2) Administrative reorganization. With few exceptions, the institutions we visited have either effected reorganizations of existing internal units or are in the process of making such plans. In every case, the rearrangements involve fewer total administrative sections, though not necessarily fewer programs.

There are a number of reasons for these kinds of changes. Units of marginal size may be merged with others for administrative savings. This provides potential release of persons for greater academic responsibilitiy who otherwise spend

all or part of their time in administrative roles; and there is more flexibility in the management of academic personnel. For example, at a number of institutions, all faculty position vacancies revert to the deans office (or with some reorganized colleges to newly established division directors), and only growing programs are considered for new faculty appointments.[4] This does not necessarily mean that a program which is stabilized (i.e., isn't growing) will not have vacancies replaced,but that such replacement is not presumed. Restructuring into larger units also tends to move budget-implicated decisions further away from the more subjective interests of smaller program identities.

3) Faculty Retraining for changed work assignments. While not so common as one might assume, there is considerable evidence of reassignment of faculty who have required additional academic preparation. In one large university we visited, a faculty member shifted from a full-time assignment in social studies to half-time in reading, where the college needed additional help. The faculty member engaged in a planned program of course audits on a reduced work load. On the basis of that experience, the institution now has six faculty in redevelopment programs. In another large institution, a faculty member in the overwhelmingly graduate-oriented guidance and counseling program

---

[4]New York University's policy states for example, "...new or replacement faculty are limited to growth programs only and faculty members who resign, are terminated, or become disabled or die are not replaced automatically."

was shifted to one-third load in undergraduate psychological foundations; another in education administration with a strong graduate background in sociology to one-third load in the social foundations. In the process, both became more effective advocates for important and needed changes in undergraduate teacher education and valuable sources of broader academic information about that aspect of the college's mission. We anticipate increasing interchanges like these, but caution deans to be aware that faculty involved in reassignment must have the appropriate opportunities to develop new competence.

4) Collaboration with other units. We found much talk about collaboration but not very much being done about it. Serious resource limitations, however, suggest that we must abandon the competitive mode so well entrenched in IHE's and develop linkages permitting sharing of resources and the development of institutional specialties that can be made available on a statewide or regional bases. Sub-specialities in fields like administration, special education, and vocational education afford good examples of programs in which institutions will probably need to depend upon resources in other universities in the same state and across contiguous state boundaries. Some universities have done an excellent job of accommodating to such needs; in some cases, it has come about through creative ways of working out half-time appointments or straightforward transfers to other university programs.

5) Program reduction or discontinuance. An alternative having the most potential for responding to

significant resource reduction is that of program reassessment. In only a very few cases is dramatic program reduction or outright elimination accomplished without very serious evaluation. Size and productivity are not always the best or even the most important bases for examining this prospect, nor, on the face of it, is duplication of similar programs elsewhere. Several cues suggest the need for critical analysis, however. These include the overall reputation of the program, analyses of its relevance to need and function (including data on productivity), and cost effectiveness. In some cases, program continuation may be contingent on some reasonable, meaningful changes or goals--perhaps an accreditation issue, or some target of quality that can be articulated. In some cases, programs may be merged with other existing programs to help strengthen both. In a number of institutions we visited, some programs were eliminated with little additional analysis other than the conventional wisdom of having to make hard choices among unwelcome alternatives. As one dean said, "Everybody in this entire institution knew that program was bad and we didn't need a good consultant to tell us what all of us already knew--we eliminated it and still, it wasn't easy to do."

Impressions and Recommendations Based on the Study

In all of our conversations with deans and other administrative officers in the institutions we visited, we found excellent examples of effective leadership and responsible administrative performance. Our impressions regarding

administrative performance and our recommendations regarding the maintenance of healthy SCDEs in the face of serious resource constraints follow:

1) In times of greatest adversity, a dean has the opportunity to be most creative, to obtain a hearing for his or her most audacious ideas, and to generate faculty support for the most sweeping kinds of changes. One dean we interviewed, for example, made substantial organizational changes that were ultimately recognized as positive but were initially considered unthinkable. The pressure of a sudden and substantial budget cut provided the dean with the impetus to grasp the nettle of a really important issue and resolve it definitively.

2) Managing the store well may not seem to be as dramatic as a charismatic leadership style; but it is by successfully balancing diverse faculty interests while enhancing the core purposes of the university that a college of education is perceived as having sound leadership. A number of our deans were seen as able,institutionally-oriented advisors in the councils of central administration and, at the same time, as honest and responsible managers of their own enterprises. Doing the job as the institution defines it is absolutely essential.

3) A dean of a college of education should stress high standards of admission, fight grade inflation, and stress the importance of research for his or her unit, even if it may be impossible to enforce these goals by fiat. Symbolism has its place, and colleges of education need to be respected rather than loved; it is possible that institutional affection will follow the former, but never will the reverse occur.

4) While it is easier said than done, deans should cut budget resources selectively rather than cut strong and weak programs equally. To accomplish selective cuts, one must have relevant and reliable data.

5) Esteem for a college of education is ordinarily earned through its ability to obtain outside grants, to recruit professors capable of publication in refereed journals, and to establish strong research institutes. Deans should strive for these goals through their considerable discretion with their budgets. But these concerns must be carefully balanced with the necessary advocacy for those activities and resources essential to the obligation of SCDE's, as professional schools--to contribute to the improvement of practice.

6) Deans should maintain teacher education as a key purpose of their colleges of education. Teacher training enrollments bring in a substantial number of student credit hours which are likely to support the research thrust. To rely solely on a graduate student population is to invite self-destruction. It is much better to argue that at least some teachers should be prepared in flagship institutions. To argue otherwise is to suggest that education is a second-rate enterprise that should not be housed in any high quality university, even at the graduate level.

7) Each university we visited was sui generis. Any general suggestions offered to deans has to be seen in the context of that uniqueness. Activities that are appropriate at one institution may be totally inappropriate at another.

Therefore, each dean must learn to cope with the local situation; that is the essence of contextualism. Still, in any situation it is important to work well with deans from other colleges and with central administration. Also, one must understand the economic conditions of the state and the nation and recognize what they portend, and at the same time pay attention to local norms and expectations. Couching a decision in all these contexts is a difficult but necessary task.

8) In times of stress, the dean must rely on the governance structure of the college. To strengthen that support it is essential that high status individuals within the college are either appointed or elected to important decision making bodies so that critical decisions have the review of respected peers.

9) Education is not a shielded unit like business, engineering, and computer science; consequently, deans of education without the political clout of strong constituencies outside the university must be perceived within the university family as uncommonly able leaders. The dean of a college of education has to develop a delicate but determined stance. This means extensive use of planning documents, careful research, sound data, and solid preparation for all encounters with central administration so that mutual respect and sound working relationships are obtained. By the same token, the need to pursue a systematic analysis of external sources of collegiate support and opposition is an increasing aspect of fundamental organizational politics; it is neither immoral nor disloyal, merely an axiomatic dimension of contemporary reality.

10) Deans are well advised to establish planning units within their colleges. In one college of education we visited, careful planning had been done for 10 years; and, as a result, the college had a firm data base and was able to provide central administration with superb plans. The upshot was that this particular college was perceived as being extremely well managed, and its reputation was visibly enhanced.

Recommendations for Central Administration

1. It is important that central administrators take the opportunity on appropriate occasions to stress the importance of the mission of the college of education in the unique setting of that particular institution. This may be more problematical in some institutions than in others. Firm pronouncements from central administration officers regarding where education stands in the institutional firmament are extremely important, particularly in the days of enrollment decline and general malaise in the public schools. Our interviews and observations confirm that colleges of education need positive support from presidents and chancellors; it is generally accepted that they do not otherwise yet possess the powerful constituent base afforded law, engineering, agriculture, business, and medicine.

2. When and if budget cuts are enforced by central administration on colleges of education, decisions regarding where cuts should be made specifically should not be directed solely by central administration; the operating unit (the SCDE) should have responsibility for suggesting and defending its own

plan within broad guidelines. In one college of education we studied, specific programs were targeted by central administration for elimination; this tactic forced the college to go on the defensive and seek outside help from its alumni and other constituents to maintain its integrity. In another similar situation, central univeristy administrators were surprised by the general support that the college enjoyed.

3. One should keep in mind the fact that major public universities can make themselves most unpopular with legislatures by retreating from their responsibility to provide teachers for the states' schools. To a large extent this is, as one of our team members expressed it to a university vice-president, not merely a matter of whether a state's teachers should be trained in the university's education unit; it is, as well, a question of whether chemistry and physics and history should be taught in the schools by those who took these courses at the university.

4. Efforts by colleges of education to venture into new fields to seek enrollment should be examined carefully. The enrollments may come, but at the expense of the central mission of the college.

Concluding Comment

During the year in which this inquiry was launched, significant events have occurred. Not the least of these has been the final report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, which has attracted impressive public attention to notable shortcomings of basic schooling in America. Much of what that panel of prestigious individuals concluded has implications

that are as important for the future of major universities' schools of education as for the improvement of elementary and secondary education. Specifically, there is a clear recognition that strengthened and more substantially funded programs in the preparation of educational personnel and for research and development in SCDEs is of paramount importance in the ultimate improvement of the quality of schooling. Thus, though the entire higher education enterprise confronts critical problems in its ability to meet the needs of our information-based, post-industrial society, the major comprehensive universities and the schools and colleges of education which they include must have significant fiscal relief if the Commission's expectations are to be met. Our inquiry has amply demonstrated that schools and colleges of education are an integral component of the proper purposes of major universities, and has demonstrated as well that they are responsibly managed and have borne more than their equal share of the resource cutbacks that have been endemic in higher education over the past several years. If the quality of American education at all levels is to be improved, then the nation's schools and colleges of education, and especially those in the major state, land grant, and private universities, must be more adequately funded and more seriously perceived as significant partners in the academic enterprise.